

# SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

105th Congress  
1st Session

Vote No. 117

June 25, 1997, 10:31 am  
Page S-6293 Temp. Record

## BALANCED BUDGET ACT/Extra Medicare-Medicaid Savings to NIH

**SUBJECT:** Balanced Budget Act of 1997 . . . S. 947. D'Amato motion to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of the D'Amato/Harkin amendment No. 451.

### ACTION: MOTION REJECTED, 46-54

**SYNOPSIS:** As reported, S. 947, the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, will make net mandatory spending reductions to achieve the savings necessary to balance the budget by 2002 and to provide the American people with tax relief. This bill is the first reconciliation bill that is required by H.Con. Res. 84, the Budget Resolution for fiscal year (FY) 1998 (see vote No. 92). The second bill will provide tax relief (see vote No. 160).

**The D'Amato amendment** would put in a trust fund any savings achieved from reforming Medicare and Medicaid above the amounts that this bill estimates will be saved. Those savings would then be used for research by the National Institutes of Health (NIH), though in any year the amount of savings spent, coupled with any appropriated funds, would not be allowed to be more than double the fiscal year (FY) 1997 appropriated amount for the NIH. No trust funds could be expended in any year in which appropriated funds declined. The trust fund would be exempt from budget enforcement procedures.

Senator Domenici raised the point of order that the D'Amato amendment violated the Budget Act. Senator D'Amato then moved to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of the amendment. Debate on a debatable motion to a reconciliation bill is limited to 1 hour. Debate was further limited by unanimous consent. Generally, those favoring the motion to waive favored the amendment; those opposing the motion to waive opposed the amendment.

NOTE: A three-fifths majority (60) vote is required to waive the Budget Act. Following the failure of the motion to waive, the point of order was upheld and the amendment thus fell.

**Those favoring** the motion to waive contended:

The D'Amato/Harkin amendment has strong, bipartisan support. It would provide the funding for health research that Senators,

(See other side)

YEAS (46)			NAYS (54)			NOT VOTING (0)	
Republicans (11 or 20%)	Democrats (35 or 78%)		Republicans (44 or 80%)	Democrats (10 or 22%)		Republicans (0)	Democrats (0)
D'Amato	Akaka	Kohl	Abraham	Hatch	Baucus		
DeWine	Biden	Landrieu	Allard	Helms	Bingaman		
Faircloth	Boxer	Lautenberg	Ashcroft	Hutchinson	Bryan		
Grassley	Breaux	Leahy	Bennett	Hutchison	Bumpers		
Jeffords	Cleland	Levin	Bond	Inhofe	Byrd		
Mack	Conrad	Lieberman	Brownback	Kempthorne	Dodd		
Murkowski	Daschle	Moseley-Braun	Burns	Kyl	Feingold		
Specter	Dorgan	Moynihan	Campbell	Lott	Glenn		
Stevens	Durbin	Murray	Chafee	Lugar	Kerrey		
Thurmond	Feinstein	Reed	Coats	McCain	Mikulski		
Warner	Ford	Reid	Cochran	McConnell			
	Graham	Robb	Collins	Nickles			
	Harkin	Rockefeller	Coverdell	Roberts			
	Hollings	Sarbanes	Craig	Roth			
	Inouye	Torricelli	Domenici	Santorum			
	Johnson	Wellstone	Enzi	Sessions			
	Kennedy	Wyden	Frist	Shelby			
	Kerry		Gorton	Smith, Bob			
			Gramm	Smith, Gordon			
			Grams	Snowe			
			Gregg	Thomas			
			Hagel	Thompson			
						<b>EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:</b>	
						1—Official Business	
						2—Necessarily Absent	
						3—Illness	
						4—Other	
						<b>SYMBOLS:</b>	
						AY—Announced Yea	
						AN—Announced Nay	
						PY—Paired Yea	
						PN—Paired Nay	

Compiled and written by the staff of the Republican Policy Committee—Larry E. Craig, Chairman

by a unanimous vote, recently went on record as favoring (see vote No. 78). It would provide that money without taking any funds away from any other program and without harming efforts to balance the budget. We believe that it would achieve that feat because we are convinced that the savings from the Medicare and Medicaid reforms in this bill are understated. We are confident that there will be greater than expected savings. What this amendment would do is require those extra savings to be spent on health care research. If no extra savings materialized, no extra money would be spent. Biomedical research has led to huge advances in recent decades, and further breakthroughs are tantalizingly close. The quicker we achieve breakthroughs, the more lives we will save. At present, though, most worthy research projects are not funded because there just is not enough money to go around. We need to provide more money for research. If the Budget Act is not waived for this amendment, when extra funds become available there will be great pressure on Congress to spend those funds on a variety of other purposes, and health research will likely again be underfunded. We should not allow that to happen. We should lock in any possible savings now for health research. We therefore strongly support the motion to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of the D'Amato/Harkin amendment.

**Those opposing** the motion to waive contended:

We must reluctantly oppose this amendment. This bill will enact numerous reforms to increase the solvency of Medicare, but those reforms will only save the program from insolvency for 10 years. More clearly needs to be done. If the savings from the reforms in this bill are greater than expected, they should be put right back into the Medicare program to make it stronger. They should not be diverted to appropriated accounts, no matter how meritorious. Therefore, we cannot support the motion to waive the Budget Act for the consideration of this amendment.